UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,811	04/21/2004	Mairead Lyons	56011-3	7263

7590   05/28/2008

Brian L. Michaelis
Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Two Seaport Lane
Suite 300
Boston, MA 02210-2028

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _27 February 2008_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _22-40_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _22-40_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 22-40 are rejected and claims 1-21 have been canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 27

February 2008 has been entered.

Claim Objections

3.   **Claims 39 and 40** are objected to because of the following informalities: each

claim is dependent on a canceled claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   **Claims 20-32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6.   **Claim 20** is directed towards a system. However, it is noted that the use of the

word "system" does not inherently mean that the claim is directed towards a machine or

article of manufacture. Each component of the claimed system can be interpreted as

comprising entirely of software per se according to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Therefore, the claim language fails to provide the necessary hardware required for the

claim to fall within the statutory category of an system.

> According to MPEP 2106:
>
> The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.
>
> Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)
>
> Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

Since **claims 21-32** are dependent on claim 20 and fail to overcome the

deficiencies of claim 20, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 20.

7.   To allow for compact prosecution, the examiner will apply prior art to these

claims as best understood, with the assumption that applicant will amend to overcome

the stated 101 rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   **Claims 22-30, 33-36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al (hereafter Matson) in

view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al (hereafter Moss).

        Referring to claim 22, Matson discloses a system for processing expense

information comprising:

        a generic file parser [process 211] adapted to receive said expense information

from a plurality of expense data providers [sources 101, 103 and 105], wherein said

expense information includes data in a plurality of formats (see [0031]; [0037] and

[0038]);

        at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said

plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being adapted to overwrite functions

of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats

corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules (see [0037] and [0038]);

        at least one extension of a specific parsing module, the at least one extension

being adapted to process specific fields of said expense information (see [0037] and

[0038]).

However, Matson fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of sorting the

parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables. Moss discloses the insertion of

transactional data into a database, including the further limitation of sorting the parsed

data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging tables] (se [0465]) in order to increases

efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough

understanding of data beforehand.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to load the XML file data of Matson into the staging tables as disclosed by

Moss. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increases efficiency by

avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough

understanding of data beforehand (Matson: see [0035], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 23, the combination of Matson and Moss (hereafter

Matson/Moss) discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the generic file parser is

adapted to process said expense information that is received in a generic format; and

wherein said specific fields that are to be processed by said extensions do not agree

with the generic format (Matson: see [0037] and [0038]).

Referring to claim 24, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 22, further

comprising:

an incoming data receiving component [IM 107], to connect to a source of data

[sources 101, 103 and 105] and receive incoming data (Matson: see [0031]);

a loader component, in communication with said parsing component, to receive

parsed data from said parsing component, and to sort said parsed data [stores in XML

file 215] (Matson: see [0039], lines 1-3) into a plurality of temporary tables (Moss: see

[0465]) as a function of said plurality of fields (Matson: see [0037]);

a data sorting component [data load technician] in communication with said

plurality of temporary tables and with said database to access sorted data in said

plurality of temporary tables, and to re-sort said sorted data into a plurality of tables

[files] in said database [database 111] (Matson: see [0059]-[0060]; Moss: see [0037]).

Referring to claim 25, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 25 wherein

said loader component – processes said parsed data into a proper format [XML] for

insertion into said database [database 111] (Matson: see [0036]-[0037], lines 1-3);

stores said parsed data in a file [supplier XML file 215] (see [0039], lines 3-8);

said loader component being further configured to deactivate access to a

temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]) and load said file into said

temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]) and thereafter re-activate access

to said temporary table (Moss: see [0465]).

Referring to claim 26, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 24 wherein

said data sorting component also inserts relational link information in said plurality of

tables in said database [loading relational data into database 111] (Matson: see [0035],

lines 7-10).

Referring to claim 27, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 24 wherein

said data sorting component, upon accessing a data item in said temporary tables that

indicates an error, moves said data item into a corresponding error table [faulty products

data file] (see Matson [0043]).

Referring to claim 28, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 22 wherein at least one specific function is implemented into a specific parsing component which encapsulates said generic parsing component, said at least one specific function modifying functionality of said generic parsing component so that said specific parsing component can parse data in a specific format (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 29, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 28 wherein said at least one specific function overrides corresponding functionality in said generic parsing component (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 30, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 24 wherein said data sorting component processes data in terms of one of: transaction data [product transactions] (Matson: see [0023]), line item data, additional data, enhanced data, trip leg data, and card balance data.

Referring to claim 33, Matson discloses a method for processing expense information comprising:

providing a generic file parser [process 211] adapted to receive said expense information from a plurality of expense data providers [sources 101, 103 and 105], wherein said expense information includes data in a plurality of formats (see [0031]; [0037] and [0038]);

providing at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being adapted to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of

formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules (see [0037] and

[0038]);

receiving said expense information from said plurality of expense data providers

(see [0031]);

said generic file parser [process 211] parsing said expense information as a

function of a plurality of fields [supplier name, supplier product number, etc] to form

parsed data (see [0037]);

a data sorting component [data load technician] to re-sort said sorted data into a

plurality of tables [files] in said database [database 111] (see [0059]-[0060]); and

resorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in a database (see [0059]-

[0060]).

However, Matson fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of sorting the

parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables. Moss discloses the insertion of

transactional data into a database, including the further limitation of sorting the parsed

data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging tables] (se [0465]) in order to increases

efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough

understanding of data beforehand.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to load the XML file data of Matson into the staging tables as disclosed by

Moss. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increases efficiency by

avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough

understanding of data beforehand (Matson: see [0035], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 34, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 33 wherein

said step of sorting said parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables includes:

processing said data into a proper format [XML] for insertion as formatted data

into said database [database 111] (Matson: see [0036]-[0037], lines 1-3);

storing said formatted data in a file [supplier XML file 215] (see [0039], lines 3-8);

deactivating access to a temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]);

loading said formatted data from said file into said temporary table in said

database (Moss: see [0465]); and

re-activating access to said data table (Moss: see [0465]).

Referring to claim 35, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 33 further

including:

during said step of inserting said sorted data into tables in said database,

inserting relational link information in said plurality of tables in said database [loading

relational data into database 111] (Matson: see [0035], lines 7-10).

Referring to claim 36, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 33 wherein

said step of re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in said database

includes: if a data item indicates an error, moving said data item into a corresponding

error table in said database [faulty products data file] (see Matson [0043]).

Referring to claim 38, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 8 wherein

said step of parsing said data includes:

providing a generic parsing process, said generic parsing process including

common functionality to parse data (Matson: see [0037]); and

providing a set of specific function to be implemented in a specific parsing

process which encapsulates said generic parsing process, said set of specific functions

modifying said generic parsing process so said generic parsing process includes

functionality to parse data according to said specific set of functions (Matson: see

[0038]).

Referring to claim 39, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 15 wherein

said set of specific functions overrides corresponding functionality in said generic

parsing component (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 40, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 10 wherein

said step re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in said database includes

processing said sorted data in terms of one of transaction data [product transactions]

(Matson: see [0023]), line item data, additional data, enhanced data, trip leg data, and

card balance data.

10.   Claims 31, 32 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub

2005/0160014 to Moss et al as applied respectively to claims 22 and 33 above, and

further in view of US Patent No 6,633,878 to Underwood (hereafter Underwood).

Referring to claims 31 and 37, Matson/Moss discloses transactions, however,

Matson/Moss fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said data is

transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card.

Underwood discloses initializing an ecommerce database framework, including the

further limitation wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card (see column 107, lines 56-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the feature of Underwood wherein commercial credit cards represent the transactions with the system of Matson/Moss. One would have been motivated to do so since Matson/Moss handles data received from real-time data feeds (Matson: see [0023], lines 3-7).

Referring to claim 32, the combination of Matson/Moss and Underwood discloses the system of claim 31 wherein said data sorting component includes additional information in said data tables regarding tax information for said transactional data (Underwood: see column 116, lines 7-17).

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments filed in regards claims 22-40 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The new independent claims are broader than what the applicants are arguing as being stated in claims 5 and 6. Therefore, the arguments are considered to be moot since the limitation that they pertain to are no longer stated.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/   Kimberly Lovel
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167   Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 2167

26 May 2008
kml